

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/791,194	10/791,194 03/02/2004		Frank L. Hall	4718.2US (00-0316.02/US)	1948	
24247	7590	10/06/2006		EXAMINER		
TRASK BR			HEINRICH, SAMUEL M			
P.O. BOX 25	550					
SALT LAKE	CITY, U	JT 84110	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,				1725	•	
				DATE MAILED: 10/06/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/791,194 HALL, FRANK L.						
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
		Samuel M. Heinrich	1725					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ad	ldress				
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior tre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat reply received by the Office later than three months after the mai ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this or BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
		is action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4)⊠	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.						
Applicati	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.						
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on 02 March 2004 is/are	: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj	ected to by the Examiner	•				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 								
Attachmen 1) Notic 2) Notic 3) Infor	the of References Cited (PTO-892) the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) ☐ Interview S Paper No(s	received. Summary (PTO-413) S)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/19/06;9/18/06. 2 5 6) Other:								

Application/Control Number: 10/791,194

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of USPN 5,950,071 to Hammond et al and in view of USPN 5,023,424 to Vaught and further in view of either of USPN 6,297,138 to Rimai et al or in view of USPN 5,930,606 to McCulloch. AAPA discloses (Background of the Invention, Specification pages 2-6) well known use of a laser for material removal from a workpiece surface. Hammond et al discloses (Title) Detachment and Removal of Microscopic Surface Contaminants Using a Pulsed Detach Light and discloses (column 2, lines 17-26) laser ablation which both removes particles and micro-roughens the surface. Vaught describe (Abstract) a particle removing method comprising scanning, or locating and storing, of locations of particles on a workpiece surface. Both Rimai et al (column 2, lines 16-22) and McCulloch (column 2, lines 18-46) disclose laser operation which changes the surface material property of roughness and thereby improves subsequent adhesion to the surface. The use of a removal and roughening method as disclosed by Hammond et al with a locating or scanning step as disclosed by Vaught in the well known AAPA processes of cleaning and subsequent adhesion of a compound to a surface would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was

Art Unit: 1725

made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because finding the particles prior to cleaning is known as disclosed by Vaught and laser material removal is disclosed by all the references. Use of a rough surface for improving a subsequent bond is very well known and the instant roughening with a laser is known and described by Hammond et al in a cleaning method and described by Rimai et al and McCulloch in methods of improving surface material properties for subsequent adhesion thereto.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. JP03018806A describes particular adhesive surface roughness properties.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-272-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/791,194

Art Unit: 1725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Samuel M Heinrich **Primary Examiner**

Page 4

Art Unit 1725